

REMARKS

Favorable reconsideration, reexamination, and allowance of the present patent application are respectfully requested in view of the foregoing amendments and the following remarks.

Allowable Subject Matter

Applicant gratefully acknowledges the indication, at page 7 of the Office Action, that the subject matter of Claims 2, 3, 6, 9-16, 19, 20, 21 and 24 contains allowable subject matter.

Summary of Office Action

In the March 10, 2006 Office Action:

Claims 1-25 were objected to for informalities;

Claims 1 and 26-30 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) over U.S. Patent No. 6,814,475 to Amano (Amano'475);

Claim 4 and 5 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) over Amano'475 in view of U.S. Patent No. 4,928,214 to Oyama (Oyama'214);

Claim 7 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) over Amano'475 in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,371,636 to Wesson (Wesson'636);

Claim 8 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) over Amano'475 in view of European Patent Publication No. 1,298,383 to Osram (Osram'383);

Claims 17 and 18 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) over Amano'475 in view of Oyama'214 and further in view of Wesson'636;

Claims 22 and 23 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) over Amano'475 in view of Oyama'214 and further in view of Osram'383; and

Claim 25 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) over Amano'475 in view of Wesson'636 and further in view of Osram'383.

Summary of Response to Office Action

By this Amendment, claims 1-3, 5, 8, and 20-30 are amended. The claims currently pending in this application are claims 1-30. Claims 1, 26, and 28 are the only independent claims.

Objection of Claims

With regard to the objection to claims 8 and 20-25, Applicant hereby amends the claims to change the term “saos” to “so as” in compliance with the Examiner’s request to correct this minor informality.

With regard to the objection to claims 1-25, by this Amendment, Applicant changes the term “lights” to “light” at line 7 of claim 1.

The above-noted changes to claims 1, 8, and 20-25 should be in full compliance with the Examiner’s recommendations to avoid the objections set forth in the March 10, 2006 Office Action. Accordingly, withdrawal of the objection to the claims is respectfully requested. It is respectfully submitted that the amendments to overcome the Examiner’s objections do not change the scope of the claims in any way, and are made only to correct minor informalities, as requested by the Examiner.

All Claims Define Allowable Subject Matter:

35 U.S.C. 102(e)

In the Office Action, beginning at page 2, claims 1 and 26-30 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,814,475 to Amano (Amano’475). This rejection is respectfully traversed for the following reasons.

In the present application, claim 1 recites a combination of elements including in part: a light source holder shaped in a substantially polygonal form having sides and a longitudinal axis in a direction that is substantially parallel with an optical axis of said lamp, wherein each of the polygonal sides includes at least one of said plurality of light sources.

At least this feature of claim 1 is neither taught nor suggested by Amano'475. By contrast, Amano'475 discloses an LED-Type Vehicular Lamp that includes a first LED light source group 22 formed by a plurality (five) LED light sources 28 arranged facing upward, and a second LED light source group 42 is formed by a plurality (five) LED light sources 48 arranged back to back with respect to the LED light source group 22. First and second reflectors (26 and 46) are provided for reflecting light from each of the light source groups (22 and 42) forward of the lamp. Nowhere is there a light source holder shaped in a substantially polygonal form wherein each of the polygonal sides of the light source holder includes at least one light source.

With regard to claim 26, Amano'475 fails to disclose or teach at least the feature of at least three reflector surfaces and at least three LED rays...each of the reflector surfaces configured to direct light emitted from one of said at least three LED arrays into a certain light distribution pattern.

With regard to claim 28, Amano'475 fails to disclose or teach at least the feature of a light source holder including at least three surfaces that each extend substantially parallel to the optical axis of the LED type lamp and at least one of the LED chips is oriented on each of the at least three surfaces.

"A claim is anticipated only if each and every element as set forth in the claim is found, either expressly or inherently described, in a single prior art reference." M.P.E.P. § 2131 (citing *Verdegaal Bros. v. Union Oil Co. Of California*, 2 USPQ2d 1051, 1053 (Fed. Cir. 1987)). Accordingly, it is respectfully submitted that the Amano'475 patent fails to meet the criteria for anticipating independent claims 1, 26, and 28 because the Amano'475 patent fails to disclose or teach at least those claimed features as recited above.

Further, since claim 27 depends from and respectively incorporates all the features of claim 26, claim 27 is also not anticipated by the Amano'475 patent at least for the above reasons for which claim 26 is not anticipated, and for the separate features that claim 27 recites.

Since claims 29 and 30 depend from and respectively incorporate all the features of claim 28, claims 29 and 30 are also not anticipated by the Amano'475 patent at least for the above reasons for which claim 28 is not anticipated, and for the separate features that claims 29 and 30 recite.

Thus, Applicant respectfully requests that the rejection of claims 1 and 26-30 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) be withdrawn.

35 U.S.C. § 103(a)

In the Office Action, beginning at page 4, Claims 4 and 5 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as obvious over the disclosure of the Amano'475 patent in view of U.S. Patent No. 4,928,214 to Oyama (the Oyama'214 patent). This rejection is respectfully traversed, and Applicant requests reconsideration for at least the following reasons.

The Oyama'214 patent fails to make up for the above-noted deficiencies with respect to the base reference of Amano'475. In particular, Oyama'214, either alone or in combination with Amano'475, fails to disclose or teach at least the feature of a vehicle lamp that includes a light source holder shaped in a substantially polygonal form having sides and a longitudinal axis in a direction that is substantially parallel with an optical axis of said lamp, wherein each of the polygonal sides includes at least one of said plurality of light sources, as recited in claim 1 and therefore included in dependent claims 4 and 5. By contrast, Oyama'214 discloses a conventional vehicle front lamp that includes light shielding units 35 and 36.

Thus, in view of the deficiencies of Oyama'214 and Amano'475, at least with respect to the above-noted claimed features, Applicant respectfully requests that the rejection of claims 4 and 5 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) be withdrawn.

Claim 7 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) over Amano'475 in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,371,636 to Wesson (Wesson'636). This rejection is respectfully traversed, and Applicant requests reconsideration for at least the following reasons.

The Wesson'636 patent fails to make up for the above-noted deficiencies with respect to the base reference of Amano'475. In particular, Wesson'636, either alone or in combination with Amano'475, fails to disclose or teach at least the feature of a vehicle lamp that includes a light source holder shaped in a substantially polygonal form having sides and a longitudinal axis in a direction that is substantially parallel with an optical axis of said lamp, wherein each of the polygonal sides includes at least one of said plurality of light sources, as recited in claim 1 and therefore included in dependent claim 7. By contrast, Wesson'636 discloses an LED light module for vehicles that can be strobed such that it is more "eye catching than...prior art light bulbs." (See column 10, lines 15-16, of the Wesson'636 specification).

Claim 7 is dependent from claim 1, and therefore includes all the features of claim 1. Neither Wesson'636 nor Amano'475, either alone or in combination, disclose or teach at least the above-noted features of claims 1 or 7. Thus, Applicant respectfully requests that the rejection of claim 7 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) be withdrawn.

Claim 8 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) over Amano'475 in view of European Patent Publication No. 1,298,383 to Osram (Osram'383). This rejection is respectfully traversed, and Applicant requests reconsideration for at least the following reasons.

The Osram'383 patent fails to make up for the above-noted deficiencies with respect to the base reference of Amano'475. In particular, Osram'383, either alone or in combination with Amano'475, fails to disclose or teach at least the feature of a vehicle lamp that includes a light source holder shaped in a substantially polygonal form having sides and a longitudinal axis in a direction that is substantially parallel with an optical axis of said lamp, wherein each of the polygonal sides includes at least one of said plurality of light sources, as recited in claim 1 and therefore as recited in dependent claim 8. By contrast, Osram'383 discloses a replaceable LED light capsule that includes chips 22 that may be oriented in such a way that the lamp generates a

unique “donut” shape radiation pattern. (See Abstract of Osram’383 specification).

Claim 8 is dependent from claim 1, and therefore includes all the features of claim 1. Neither Osram’383 nor Amano’475, either alone or in combination, disclose or teach at least the above-noted features of claims 1 or 8. Thus, Applicant respectfully requests that the rejection of claim 8 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) be withdrawn.

Claims 17 and 18 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) over Amano’475 in view of Oyama’214 and further in view of Wesson’636. This rejection is respectfully traversed, and Applicant requests reconsideration for at least the following reasons.

Oyama’214 and Wesson’636 in combination still fail to make up for the deficiency in the base reference to Amano’475. Moreover, Oyama’214 and Wesson’636, either alone or in combination with Amano’475, fail to disclose or teach at least the feature of a vehicle lamp that includes a light source holder shaped in a substantially polygonal form having sides and a longitudinal axis in a direction that is substantially parallel with an optical axis of said lamp, wherein each of the polygonal sides includes at least one of said plurality of light sources, as recited in claim 1 and therefore as recited in dependent claims 17 and 18. Thus, Applicant respectfully requests that the rejection of claims 17 and 18 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) be withdrawn.

Claims 22 and 23 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) over Amano’475 in view of Oyama’214 and further in view of Osram’383. This rejection is respectfully traversed, and Applicant requests reconsideration for at least the following reasons.

Oyama’214 and Osram’383 in combination still fail to make up for the deficiency in the base reference to Amano’475. Moreover, Oyama’214 and Osram’383, either alone or in combination with Amano’475, fail to disclose or teach at least the feature of a vehicle lamp that includes a light source holder shaped in a substantially polygonal form having sides and a longitudinal axis in a direction that is substantially parallel with an optical axis of said lamp, wherein each of the polygonal sides includes at least one of said plurality of light sources, as

recited in claim 1 and therefore as recited in dependent claims 22 and 23. Thus, Applicant respectfully requests that the rejection of claims 22 and 23 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) be withdrawn.

Claim 25 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) over Amano'475 in view of Wesson'636 and further in view of Osram'383. This rejection is respectfully traversed, and Applicant requests reconsideration for at least the following reasons.

Wesson'636 and Osram'383 in combination fail to make up for the deficiency in the base reference to Amano'475. Moreover, Wesson'636 and Osram'383, either alone or in combination with Amano'475, fail to disclose or teach at least the feature of a vehicle lamp that includes a light source holder shaped in a substantially polygonal form having sides and a longitudinal axis in a direction that is substantially parallel with an optical axis of said lamp, wherein each of the polygonal sides includes at least one of said plurality of light sources, as recited in claim 1 and therefore as recited in dependent claim 25. Thus, Applicant respectfully requests that the rejection of claim 25 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) be withdrawn.

The Office Action at the first paragraph of page 8 includes a statement of reasons for the indication of allowable subject matter. While the claimed combinations of features are patentable over the prior art for the reasons indicated in the Office Action, the claimed combinations are patentable for many different and/or additional reasons. More specifically, the patentability of the claimed combinations is not limited to (nor necessarily relies on) the particular subset of features or reasons identified in the March 10, 2006 Office Action. Rather, it is the entire combination of elements in the claims, each taken as a whole, that are patentable over the prior art, both taken alone and in hypothetical combination.

Conclusion

Applicant respectfully submits that the present patent application is in condition for allowance in its entirety. An early indication of the allowability of this patent application is therefore respectfully solicited.

If the Patent Examiner believes that a telephone conference with the undersigned would expedite passage of this patent application to issue, they are invited to call on the number below.

It is not believed that extensions of time are required, beyond those that may otherwise be provided for in accompanying documents. If, however, additional extensions of time are necessary to prevent abandonment of this application, then such extensions of time are hereby petitioned under 37 C.F.R. § 1.136(a), and the Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge fees necessitated by this paper, and to credit all refunds and overpayments, to our Deposit Account listed on the application transmittal filed with this application.

Respectfully submitted,
Cermak & Kenealy LLP

By: 
David J. Kenealy
Registration No. 40,411

U.S.P.T.O. Customer Number 39083
Cermak & Kenealy LLP
515 E. Braddock Rd., Suite B
Alexandria, Virginia 22314

703.778.6610 (v)
703.652.5101 (f)

Date: June 21, 2006